Serial Number: 10/707,853
Filed: 1/16/2004

Remarks

The Examiner objected to the use of "them" in claim 10 as unclear. Claim 10 has been amended for the Examiner's ease of review, replacing "them" with a repeat listing of the claim elements "them" plainly referenced in claim 10, as originally filed. Claim 10 syntax has also been adjusted to accommodate this voluntary non-narrowing amendment.

The Examiner rejected claims 10-13, 15-16, 22 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by *Verespej*. Claims 10 and 24, as originally filed, include the limitation that the outer conductor is retained upon application of a compression force applied between the connector body and the deformable crimp ring, the compression force applied along a longitudinal axis of the coaxial cable. Claim 16 has been amended to now also include this limitation.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has identified generic elements of the invention in the cited reference but ignored the claim limitations specifying that these elements must retain the outer conductor "upon application of a compression force applied along a longitudinal axis of the coaxial cable..". In *Verespej* the "deformable ring 25" identified by the examiner is a conventional radial crimp ring, not a crimp ring deformable via a compression force applied along a longitudinal axis of the coaxial cable. The thin extended longitudinal dimension of the "deformable ring 25" and the citation of "crimped by a standard crimping tool" (col. 4 lines 1-9) make it clear to one skilled in the art that the referenced crimping direction is radial rather than longitudinal with respect to the coaxial cable. This prior art connector configuration and the associated drawbacks are described in detail in the specification background at paragraphs 0007-0008. Because the cited reference is adapted for radial rather than longitudinal compression of the "deformable ring 25", each and every element of the present non-obvious invention does not appear in the cited reference. Therefore, rejection of claims 10-13, 15-16, 22 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is improper.

The Examiner rejected claims 14, 17-21, 23 and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Verespej* in view of *Morino, Pitschi* and *Caleffi.* The Examiner again erroneously relies upon *Verespej*, as described in detail herein above, and or fails to supply a reference combination wherein the resulting assembly includes the limitation that the outer conductor is retained upon application of a compression force applied between the connector body and the deformable crimp ring, the compression force applied along a longitudinal axis of the coaxial cable.

Applicant also respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital* 732 F.2d 1572, 1577 (Fed.Cir. 1984). Absent a showing in the prior art the Examiner has impermissibly used 'hindsight' occasioned by the applicant's teaching to hunt through the prior art for the claimed elements and combined them as claimed. *In re Zurko* 111 F.3d 887 (Fed.Cir.1997).

With respect to claims 4 and 23 the Examiner combines *Morino*, an electrical circuit encapsulated within an electrical enclosure with *Verespej*, an electrical connector. In *Morino*, the encapsulating molding resin is applied to provide the disclosed pressure sensor control unit assembly with vibration resistance, mechanical integrity or the like. Therefore, there is no teaching whatsoever with respect to electrical coaxial cable connector insulators adapted to support an inner conductor isolated from the connector body and the present non-obvious inventions further disclosure that the insulator may be formed in situ by injection molding applied via at least one opening in the connector body.

With respect to claims 17-20 the Examiner supplies *Pitschi* to demonstrate an outer conductor with annular corrugations. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has ignored the

requirement according to the claim that the annular corrugations have a cylindrical section at a peak of each corrugation. The cable identified by the Examiner is a conventional annular corrugated cable having a continuously sinusoidal corrugation rather than the claimed cylindrical section at a peak of each corrugation. For claims 18-20 (and similarly claims 28 and 29) the Examiner suggests that modifying the cable dimensions to a specific configuration is "an obvious matter of choice". Here, contrary to the Examiners citation of *In re Rose*, apparently from MPEP 2144.04, IV A, the mere size/proportion of the cable is not being modified – the cable has an entirely different configuration, to satisfy an entirely different design situation/problem. The configuration claimed by the inventor(s) is a novel solution devised for readily mating with the connector disclosed via the claimed longitudinal compression, yet still having the desired manufacturing, strength and flexibility characteristics. Because changes to the mere size/scale are not the only change with respect to the cited reference, the cable configuration disclosed and claimed cannot be characterized as a mere design choice.

With respect to claims 26 and 27 the Examiner supplies *Caleffi* to show compression in the form of a die surface angled towards the cable. *Caleffi* discloses apparatus for forming metal cans such as individual aluminum beer cans. In view of *Verespej*'s failure to suggest longitudinal rather than the disclosed radial compression, applicant respectfully submits that *Caleffi* has nothing whatsoever to do with the present invention, and the Examiner's reference to providing "security for the outer conductor" has no meaning as the required teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the cited combination.

As each and every element of the claimed invention fails to be disclosed, taught or suggested in the cited reference(s), and or because the cited combinations lack the required teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the cited combination, rejection of claims 14, 17-21, 23 and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper.

Serial Number: 10/707,853
Filed: 1/16/2004

BABCOCK IP

Having obviated each of the Examiners rejections, applicant respectfully requests that a notice of allowance be issued. Should the Examiner be inclined to issue an Official Action other than the notice of allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner first contact Applicant by telephone at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Babcock, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 44517

Babcock IP, LLC
24154 Lakeside Dr.
Lake Zurich, IL 60047
Telephone: 847 719-2063
Fax: 847 438-5743

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No 703 872-9306) on February 1, 2005.

Andrew D. Babcock